

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, and 27-31 are pending in the application. Applicants specifically preserve the right to pursue cancelled subject matter in one or more continuation or divisional applications.

Claims 1, 15, and 24 have been amended to correct antecedent basis and to correlate the result with the preamble. This amendment adds no new matter.

Claims 1, 15, and 24 were previously amended to add the steps of comparing the first sample to a second sample comprising mutant rhodopsin. This amendment adds no new matter and is supported by the specification, e.g., on page 25, lines 31-32, page 35, lines 15-16, page 42, lines 21-22, and page 42, lines 44, lines 11-27.

The rejections will be addressed in the order presented in the Office Action.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The claims were rejected as allegedly lacking written description. Applicants clarify that claims 14, 23, and 32 do not provide support for the amended claims. However, support for the amended claims can be found on page 25, lines 31-32, page 35, lines 15-16, page 42, lines 21-22, and page 44, lines 11-27.

The Examiner states that although mutant rhodopsin is disclosed in the application, there is no support for using a mutant rhodopsin in the screening assays of the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse. For example, the specification on page 25, lines 31-32 and on page 42, lines 21-22 explicitly state that rhodopsin can be used as the GPCR in the assays of the invention. The specification on page 35, lines 15-15 further states that the GPCRs used in the assays of the invention can be mutant GPCRs. Finally, the specification on page 44, lines 11-18, describes a specific mutant rhodopsin, Rh1 Δ 356, which is C-terminally truncated by 18 amino acids. Page 44, lines 19-27 describes that the *rdgc* phenotype was examined using cells expressing the mutant rhodopsin. Therefore, the present specification specifically describes using mutant rhodopsins in the assays of the invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The claims were rejected as allegedly indefinite for lacking a step that corresponded to the preamble, and for lacking antecedent basis. Applicants have amended the claims to address these rejections. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,


Annette S. Parent
Reg. No. 42,058

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300

60846573 v1